

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0017] of the specification to correct a typographical error with respect to the word missile.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 21, 23 and 29 are requested to be cancelled without prejudice. Claim 15 is currently being amended. No new subject matter is being added. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 15, 19-20 and 24-28 are now pending in this application.

I. Claim Rejections

A. Claim rejection under 35 USC 112

On page 2 of the Office Action dated November 13, 2008, Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that “the recitation of ‘a missile’ is not disclosed in the specification.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Paragraph [0017] specifically refers to a missile. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 28 be withdrawn.

A. Claim rejections under 35 USC 103

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 19-20 and 23-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “CORBA Delays in Software-Defined Radio”, by Bertrand et al. (Bertrand) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0108382 (Murotake)

and in further view of “Implementation of a WNW within the JTRS Operating Environment Using Networking APIs”, by Anderson et al. (Anderson).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, however, in order to expedite prosecution, Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 21, 23 and 29 are requested to be cancelled without prejudice. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 21, 23 and 29 is moot.

II. Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

With respect to the rejection of independent Claim 15 and dependent Claims 19-20 and 24-27 under 35 USC 103(a), on page 11 of the Office Action dated November 13, 2008, the Examiner stated that:

The combination of claims 15 and 29 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the combination of claims 15 and 29.

Applicant thanks Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent Claim 15 to include all of the limitations of Claim 29. Applicant notes that Claim 15 is also amended for clarity.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15, as amended, is allowable. Claims 19-20 and 24-28 depend from Claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 15.

* * *

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 7, 2009

By /Joseph N. Ziebert/

Customer Number: 26383

Telephone: (319) 295-8280

Facsimile: (319) 295-8777

Joseph N. Ziebert
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,421